UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/547,397 | 04/11/2000 | Hiroshi Satomi | 862.C1898 | 4943 |

5514 7590 05/23/2002

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| LIANG, GWEN | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2172 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/547,397 | Applicant(s) SATOMI ET AL. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Examiner GWEN LIANG | Art Unit 2172 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-38* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *5 and 9* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *8* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claims 5, 9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 5, the second element (page 6, lines 2-6), wherein the concept "a selection step of selecting, as the output information, information corresponding to a large number of keywords with values close to a value of the one or keywords from the plurality of candidate information." is unclear to the examiner. The examiner assumes that it is equivalent to "a selection step of selecting, as the output information, information corresponding to a large sum value of the one or keywords from the plurality of candidate information."

Claim 9 (page 6), the application of "... storing in advance at least one apparatus keyword of a terminal apparatus for outputting the output information and a weight value of each apparatus keyword, and taking the weight value of each apparatus keyword into consideration." is unclear to the examiner.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. "A signal" is not tangibly embodied in a computer-readable medium, and hence non-statutory.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The use of "signal" claimed in claims 30-38 is not disclosed in the specification. The specification describes "signal" (Page 126 lines 15-17) as "... a predetermined signal is sent to the P service terminal through the infrared communication section by operating the P-code key".

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-17, 19-22, 24-26, 28-31, 33-35, 37, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morita, (U.S. Patent No. 5,297,042).

With respect to claim 1, Morita discloses a search method ...comprising:

an assignment step ...(Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword..."); (col. 1 lines 36-39, "...a large number of fields [candidate information], each corresponding to one or more keywords, must be determined to correctly retrieve documents

which are required by the user."); (col. 4 lines 10-12, "The weight data ... corresponding to the keywords K are supplied from the input analysis unit 1 ...") and

an arithmetic step ...(col. 2 lines 58-61, "The associative retrieval unit 2 calculates a relevance value of each document on the basis of the weight data Qk, the relationship values and the importance values in accordance with predetermined equations [predetermined arithmetic operation]."); (col. 5 lines 25-30, "... the relevance value for each document is calculated on the basis of the relationship value between the keywords and the importance value [weight] of the keyword in every document and then the retrieval result in accordance with the relevance value for every document is obtained."); and

a selection step ... (col. 2 lines 58-65, "The associative retrieval unit 2 calculates a relevance value of each document on the basis of the weight data Qk, the relationship values and the importance values in accordance with predetermined equations. The relevance value of each document represents the degree of relevance in satisfying the user's requirement. The associative retrieval unit 2 supplies the relevance value of each document to the output controller 3."); (col. 4 lines 14-36, "The weight data Qk ... is multiplied by the link factor Wkj in the keyword connection link 9. ... In the j-th unit in the hidden layer 6, an addition for generating the sum of the n products Qk * Wkj (k=1, 2, .sup...., n) which are supplied from n units in the input layer 5 via the keyword connection link 9 and a threshold processing are performed. ... In the i-th unit in the output layer 7, an addition for generating the sum of the n products Kj * Sji (j =1, 2,..., n) which are supplied from n units in the hidden layer 6 via the keyword-document connection link 10 ... are performed. Then the result Di is obtained as the relevance value. That is, each unit in the output layer 7 outputs the relevance value Di as the retrieval result.").

Claim 2 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Morita discloses a method wherein

the predetermined arithmetic operation is multiplication of the weight values (col. 4 lines 14-16, "The weight data Qk ... is multiplied by the link factor Wkj in the keyword connection link 9."); and

information corresponding to a large sum value of the arithmetic results is selected as the output information (col. 4 lines 28-34, "In the i-th unit in the output layer 7, an addition for generating the sum of the n products Kj * Sji (j =1, 2,..., n) which are supplied from n units in the hidden layer 6 via the keyword-document connection link 10 and a threshold processing [for selecting large sum value] are performed. Then the result Di is obtained as the relevance value.").

Claim 4 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Morita discloses a method comprising:

an input step ...; and a first storage step ...; and second storage step (Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit [predetermined terminal] for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword, an operating unit [management server] having first factors corresponding to relationship values, each relationship value being defined as a degree of the relationship between two keywords out of keywords which are predetermined in the document retrieval system and second factors corresponding to importance values [weight], each importance value being defined as a degree of importance of a keyword [weight of keyword] in each one of a plurality of documents [stored

candidate information] which are predetermined in the document retrieval system [information provider].").

With respect to claim 5, Morita discloses a search method ...comprising:

a registration step ...(Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword..."); and

a selection step ...(col. 4 lines 28-34, "In the i-th unit in the output layer 7, an addition for generating the sum of the n products Kj * Sji (j =1, 2,..., n ) which are supplied from n units in the hidden layer 6 via the keyword-document connection link 10 and a threshold processing [for selecting large sum value] are performed. Then the result Di is obtained as the relevance value.").

Claim 6 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 5 and furthermore Morita discloses a method comprising:

a first storage step ...(Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes ... an operating unit ... having ... second factors corresponding to importance values, each importance value being defined as a degree of importance of a keyword in each one of a plurality of documents [stored candidate information] which are predetermined in the document retrieval system [information provider]."). and

a second storage step (Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword..."); ...

With respect to claim 8, Morita discloses a search method ...comprising:

an assignment step ...(Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword...") ; (col. 1 lines 36-39, "...a large number of fields [candidate information], each corresponding to one or more keywords, must be determined to correctly retrieve documents which are required by the user."); (col. 4 lines 10-12, "The weight data ... corresponding to the keywords K are supplied from the input analysis unit 1 ...") and

a registration step ...(Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword..."); and

an arithmetic step ...(col. 2 lines 58-61, "The associative retrieval unit 2 calculates a relevance value of each document on the basis of the weight data Qk, the relationship values and the importance values in accordance with predetermined equations [predetermined arithmetic operation]."); (col. 5 lines 25-30, "... the relevance value for each document is calculated on the basis of the relationship value between the keywords and the importance value [weight] of the keyword in every document and then the retrieval result in accordance with the relevance value for every document is obtained."); and

a calculation step ...(col. 2 lines 58-65, "The associative retrieval unit 2 calculates a relevance value of each document on the basis of the weight data Qk, the relationship values and the importance values in accordance with predetermined equations. The relevance value of each document represents the degree of relevance in satisfying the user's requirement. The associative retrieval unit 2 supplies the relevance value of each document to the output controller 3."); (col. 4 lines 14-36, "The weight data Qk ... is multiplied by the link factor Wkj in the keyword

connection link 9. ... In the j-th unit in the hidden layer 6, an addition for generating the sum of the n products Qk * Wkj (k=1, 2, .sup...., n) which are supplied from n units in the input layer 5 via the keyword connection link 9 and a threshold processing are performed. ... In the i-th unit in the output layer 7, an addition for generating the sum of the n products Kj * Sji (j =1, 2,..., n) which are supplied from n units in the hidden layer 6 via the keyword-document connection link 10 ... are performed. Then the result Di is obtained as the relevance value. That is, each unit in the output layer 7 outputs the relevance value Di as the retrieval result.").

a quantification step ...(Abstract, "... an operating unit having first factors corresponding to relationship values, each relationship value being defined as a degree of the relationship [matching] between two keywords out of keywords which are predetermined in the document retrieval system..."); (col. 4 lines 14-16, "The weight data Qk supplied to the k-th unit in the input layer 5 is multiplied by the link factor Wkj in the keyword connection link 9. [quantification step]"); (Abstract, "... the operation unit generating a relevance value, which represents a degree of relevance [matching] in satisfying a user's requirement, for each of the documents on the basis of the retrieval condition input [user keyword] from the inputting unit ..."); and

a selection step ...(col. 4 lines 14-48, "The weight data Qk supplied to the k-th unit in the input layer 5 is multiplied by the link factor Wkj in the keyword connection link 9. [quantification step] ... In the j-th unit in the hidden layer 6, an addition for generating the sum of the n products Qk * Wkj (k=1, 2, ..., n) which are supplied from n units in the input layer 5 via the keyword connection link 9 and a threshold processing are performed. Then the result ... is multiplied by the link factor Sji [keyword importance value] in the keyword-document

connection link 10.... In the i-th unit in the output layer 7, an addition for generating the sum of the n products Kj * Sji (j =1, 2,..., n ) [keyword relationship and importance values] which are supplied from n units in the hidden layer 6 via the keyword-document connection link 10 and a threshold processing are performed. Then the result Di is obtained as the relevance value. ... The output controller 3 sorts all the relevance values Di in downward sequential order of the relevance value, and generates a document list. ... the document numbers and the relevance values are arranged in the downward sequential order [a largest candidate information is listed as the first in the output list] of the relevance value. The document list is displayed on the display unit.").

Claim 9 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 8 and furthermore Morita discloses a method comprising:

a storage step ...(Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword, an operating unit having first factors corresponding to relationship values, each relationship value being defined as a degree of the relationship between two keywords out of keywords which are predetermined in the document retrieval system ...")

Claim 10 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claims 12, 13, 15 and 21, 22, 24 and 30, 31, 33 are similarly rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1, 2, 4

Claims 16, 17 and 25, 26 and 34, 35 are similarly rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 5, 6.

Claims 19, 20 and 28, 29 and 37, 38 are similarly rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 8, 9.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3, 14, 23, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita (U.S. Patent No. 5,297,042) and further in view of Herz et al., "Herz" (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,087).

Claim 3 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 2 and furthermore Morita discloses a method wherein when a result of the predetermined arithmetic operation for weight values of a set of keywords has a relatively large positive value, it is determined that a relationship is strong. (col. 2 lines 58-63, "The associative retrieval unit 2 calculates a relevance value of each document on the basis of the weight data Qk, the relationship values and the importance values in accordance with predetermined equations. The relevance value of each document represents the degree of relevance in satisfying the user's requirement [the higher the value, the stronger the relationship]").

However Morita does not explicitly disclose that the weight value includes a sign.

Herz discloses a method wherein the weight value includes a sign (col. 18 lines 60-62, "At step 1202, each of the selected attributes is multiplied by a positive or negative weight [with a negative sign or positive sign] ...").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a sign as disclosed by Herz in the weight value as disclosed by Morita. The calculated value through the use of a signed weight will be (col. 18, lines 62-64) indicative of the strength of user's preference for those target objects that have high values [large positive value] for this attribute. On the other hand, (col. 68 lines 54-67, an extremely negative weight may be assigned to an attribute, so that documents for a certain type of user will not be available at all.

Claim 14 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 13 and furthermore Morita discloses a method wherein when a result of the predetermined arithmetic operation for weight values of a set of keywords has a relatively large positive value, it is determined that a relationship is strong. (col. 2 lines 58-63, "The associative retrieval unit 2 calculates a relevance value of each document on the basis of the weight data Qk, the relationship values and the importance values in accordance with predetermined equations. The relevance value of each document represents the degree of relevance in satisfying the user's requirement [the higher the value, the stronger the relationship]").

However Morita does not explicitly disclose that the weight value includes a sign.

Herz discloses a method wherein the weight value includes a sign (col. 18 lines 60-62, "At step 1202, each of the selected attributes is multiplied by a positive or negative weight [with a negative sign or positive sign] ...").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a sign as disclosed by Herz in the weight value as disclosed by Morita. The calculated value through the use of a signed weight will be (col. 18, lines 62-64)

indicative of the strength of user's preference for those target objects that have high values [large positive value] for this attribute. On the other hand, (col. 68 lines 54-67, an extremely negative weight may be assigned to an attribute, so that documents for a certain type of user will not be available at all.

Claim 23 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 22 and furthermore Morita discloses a method wherein when a result of the predetermined arithmetic operation for weight values of a set of keywords has a relatively large positive value, it is determined that a relationship is strong. (col. 2 lines 58-63, "The associative retrieval unit 2 calculates a relevance value of each document on the basis of the weight data Qk, the relationship values and the importance values in accordance with predetermined equations. The relevance value of each document represents the degree of relevance in satisfying the user's requirement [the higher the value, the stronger the relationship]").

However Morita does not explicitly disclose that the weight value includes a sign.

Herz discloses a method wherein the weight value includes a sign (col. 18 lines 60-62, "At step 1202, each of the selected attributes is multiplied by a positive or negative weight [with a negative sign or positive sign] ...").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a sign as disclosed by Herz in the weight value as disclosed by Morita. The calculated value through the use of a signed weight will be (col. 18, lines 62-64) indicative of the strength of user's preference for those target objects that have high values [large positive value] for this attribute. On the other hand, (col. 68 lines 54-67, an extremely negative

weight may be assigned to an attribute, so that documents for a certain type of user will not be available at all.

Claim 32 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 31 and furthermore Morita discloses a method wherein when a result of the predetermined arithmetic operation for weight values of a set of keywords has a relatively large positive value, it is determined that a relationship is strong. (col. 2 lines 58-63, "The associative retrieval unit 2 calculates a relevance value of each document on the basis of the weight data Qk, the relationship values and the importance values in accordance with predetermined equations. The relevance value of each document represents the degree of relevance in satisfying the user's requirement [the higher the value, the stronger the relationship]").

However Morita does not explicitly disclose that the weight value includes a sign.

Herz discloses a method wherein the weight value includes a sign (col. 18 lines 60-62, "At step 1202, each of the selected attributes is multiplied by a positive or negative weight [with a negative sign or positive sign] ...").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a sign as disclosed by Herz in the weight value as disclosed by Morita. The calculated value through the use of a signed weight will be (col. 18, lines 62-64) indicative of the strength of user's preference for those target objects that have high values [large positive value] for this attribute. On the other hand, (col. 68 lines 54-67, an extremely negative weight may be assigned to an attribute, so that documents for a certain type of user will not be available at all.

8. Claims 7, 18, 27, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita (U.S. Patent No. 5,297,042) and further in view of Salmon et al., "Salmon" (U.S. Patent No. 5,592,375).

Claim 7 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 5 and furthermore Morita discloses a method wherein the input information is specific information corresponding to a predetermined code inputted by a user (Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword..."); (col. 1 lines 36-39, "...a large number of fields, each corresponding to one or more keywords, must be determined to correctly retrieve documents which are required by the user.").

However Morita does not explicitly disclose that each of the plurality of candidate information is information to be attached to the specific information and presented to the user.

Salmon discloses a method wherein

the input information is specific information corresponding to a predetermined code inputted by a user (col. 6 lines 65-66, "Selected keywords may also be identified at this time for use in retrieval."); (col. 11 lines 66-67, "FIG. 7b shows choosing specific characteristics such as companies, educational institutions, or a keyword 704."); and

each of the plurality of candidate information is information to be attached to the specific information and presented to the user (col. 12 lines 24-26, "The Buyer's Interface displays those products [specific information] 720 with the close matches, along with the matching characteristics 722 [candidate information].); (col. 12 lines 28-32, "The Buyer's Interface shows the Product Profile information 724 on chosen candidates, and indicates whether additional

each of the plurality of candidate information is information to be attached to the specific information and presented to the user (col. 12 lines 24-26, "The Buyer's Interface displays those products [specific information] 720 with the close matches, along with the matching characteristics 722 [candidate information].); (col. 12 lines 28-32, "The Buyer's Interface shows the Product Profile information 724 on chosen candidates, and indicates whether additional information is associated with the candidate's Product Profile. The buyer can display this additional information ...").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of attaching candidate information to the specific information and present to the user as disclosed by Salmon with the document retrieval method as disclosed by Morita , which will allow the user (col. 12 lines 31-32) to display additional information of interest, including multimedia information ...").

Claim 27 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 25 and furthermore Morita discloses a method wherein the input information is specific information corresponding to a predetermined code inputted by a user (Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword..."); (col. 1 lines 36-39, "...a large number of fields, each corresponding to one or more keywords, must be determined to correctly retrieve documents which are required by the user.").

However Morita does not explicitly disclose that each of the plurality of candidate information is information to be attached to the specific information and presented to the user.

Salmon discloses a method wherein

the input information is specific information corresponding to a predetermined code inputted by a user (col. 6 lines 65-66, "Selected keywords may also be identified at this time for use in retrieval."); (col. 11 lines 66-67, "FIG. 7b shows choosing specific characteristics such as companies, educational institutions, or a keyword 704."); and

each of the plurality of candidate information is information to be attached to the specific information and presented to the user (col. 12 lines 24-26, "The Buyer's Interface displays those products [specific information] 720 with the close matches, along with the matching characteristics 722 [candidate information]."); (col. 12 lines 28-32, "The Buyer's Interface shows the Product Profile information 724 on chosen candidates, and indicates whether additional information is associated with the candidate's Product Profile. The buyer can display this additional information ...").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of attaching candidate information to the specific information and present to the user as disclosed by Salmon with the document retrieval method as disclosed by Morita , which will allow the user (col. 12 lines 31-32) to display additional information of interest, including multimedia information ...").

Claim 36 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 34 and furthermore Morita discloses a method wherein the input information is specific information corresponding to a predetermined code inputted by a user (Abstract, "A document retrieval system includes an inputting unit for inputting a retrieval condition including one or a plurality of keywords and a weight value for each keyword..."); (col. 1 lines 36-39, "...a large number of fields, each

corresponding to one or more keywords, must be determined to correctly retrieve documents which are required by the user.").

However Morita does not explicitly disclose that each of the plurality of candidate information is information to be attached to the specific information and presented to the user.

Salmon discloses a method wherein

the input information is specific information corresponding to a predetermined code inputted by a user (col. 6 lines 65-66, "Selected keywords may also be identified at this time for use in retrieval."); (col. 11 lines 66-67, "FIG. 7b shows choosing specific characteristics such as companies, educational institutions, or a keyword 704."); and

each of the plurality of candidate information is information to be attached to the specific information and presented to the user (col. 12 lines 24-26, "The Buyer's Interface displays those products [specific information] 720 with the close matches, along with the matching characteristics 722 [candidate information].); (col. 12 lines 28-32, "The Buyer's Interface shows the Product Profile information 724 on chosen candidates, and indicates whether additional information is associated with the candidate's Product Profile. The buyer can display this additional information ...").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of attaching candidate information to the specific information and present to the user as disclosed by Salmon with the document retrieval method as disclosed by Morita , which will allow the user (col. 12 lines 31-32) to display additional information of interest, including multimedia information ...").

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Logan et al., U.S. Patent 5,721,827: a system for selectively distributing personalized information and entertainment programming to subscribers

**Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GWEN LIANG whose telephone number is 703-305-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 A.M. - 5:30 P.M. Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KIM VU can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

G.L.
May 6, 2002

SHAHID AL ALAM
PATENT EXAMINER